



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/734,811

12/11/2003

Sundeep Bhan

49298-043

2784

21890

7590

05/25/2006

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
PATENT DEPARTMENT
1585 BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10036-8299

EXAMINER

OUELLETTE, JONATHAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 05/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

MAY 25 2006

GROUP 3600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/734,811
Filing Date: December 11, 2003
Appellant(s): BHAN ET AL.

Robert S. Mayer
Reg. No. 38,544
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 3/10/2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 8/15/2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

No evidence is relied upon by the examiner in the rejection of the claims under appeal.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
2. **Claims 1, 6, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gal et al. (WO 01/52106 A2).**
3. As per independent Claim 1, Gal discloses a method of selectively distributing invitations for a plurality of events (Abstract), the method comprising the steps of: storing event information about each of a plurality of events (C3 L8-11, the user creates a message and provides profile information – the message would inherently be saved in order to do a query on members), wherein the event information for each of the plurality of events includes at least one invitee selection criterion (C3 L8-15, profile information); storing member information

about each of a plurality of members (C3 L8-15, database of recipients); detecting, for each of the plurality of members, whether the at least one invitee selection criterion for each of the events matches the member information (C2 L11-13, C3 L8-15, C5 L6-12, C6 L7-13); and sending an e-mail invitation (C3 L15, C4 L5-10) to at least some of the members for whom a match was detected in the detecting step (C3 L8-15), wherein the e-mail invitation invites its recipient to at least some of the events for which a match was detected in the detecting step, and wherein at least one of the e-mail invitations sent in the sending step invites its recipient to a plurality of events for which a match was detected in the detecting steps (Invitations, Fig.4, C5 L26-27).

4. As per independent Claims 6 and 15, Gal discloses a method of selectively distributing invitations for a plurality of events (Abstract), the method comprising the steps of: storing event information about each of a plurality of events (C3 L8-11, the user creates a message and provides profile information – the message would inherently be saved in order to do a query on members), wherein the event information for each of the plurality of events includes at least one invitee selection criterion (C3 L8-15, profile information); storing member information about each of a plurality of members (C3 L8-15, database of recipients), wherein the member information for each of the plurality of members includes at least one member preference (C3 L8-15, C5 L6-12, C6 L7-13); determining, based on (a) matches between the member information and the at least one invitee selection criterion for each of the plurality of events and (b) matches between the event

information and the at least one member preference for the respective members, which events each of the plurality of members should be invited to (C2 L11-13, C3 L8-15, C5 L6-12, C6 L7-13); and sending [e-mail] invitations to the members based on results of the determining steps (C3 L8-15), wherein the invitations are sent via e-mail and at least one of the invitations invites its recipients to more than one of the events (C3 L15, C4 L5-10).

(10) Response to Argument

1. As per independent Claims 1, 6, and 15, the Appellant has made the argument that the cited prior art of Gal does not teach or suggest wherein at least one of the invitations must (a) invite its recipient to a plurality of events and (b) be sent via e-mail.
2. However, as explained by the Appellant in the Appeal Brief, Gal describes a multi-event invitation at p.5, lines 15-20 and in Fig.4.
3. Furthermore, Gal discloses two methods of dispatching the invitations: 1) through a dynamic web page *or* 2) through E-mail (C3 L15, C4 L5-10).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the Examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.



For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Art Unit: 3629

Respectfully submitted,

Jonathan Ouellette


May 18, 2006



JOHN G. WEISS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Conferees:

John Weiss
Dean Nguyen



Proskauer Rose LLP
Patent Department
1585 Broadway
New York, NY 10036-8299